

W



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
 United States Patent and Trademark Office  
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
 P.O. Box 1450  
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/661,986	09/14/2000	Harold Rosen	pd-2000083	8909
20991	7590	04/05/2005	EXAMINER	
THE DIRECTV GROUP INC PATENT DOCKET ADMINISTRATION RE/R11/A109 P O BOX 956 EL SEGUNDO, CA 90245-0956			LY, NGHI H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2686	

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/661,986	ROSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nghi H. Ly	2686	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 02/072005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) a set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 4-24.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Attached.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

*Marsha D Banks-Harold*

MARSHA D. BANKS-HAROLD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

**DETAILED ACTION*****Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 02/07/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On pages 2, 3 and 4 of applicant's remarks, applicant argues that Durvasula fails to teach "suppressing a side lobe of a beam having a first resource by selectively reshaping the antenna surface at interference locations and maintaining a shape of the antenna in non-interference locations to form a suppressed portion and a non-suppressed portion so that the non-suppressed portion aligns with the second resource cell and side lobe suppressed portion aligns with the first resource cell".

The examiner, however, disagrees. Durvasula indeed teaches selectively suppressing (column 2, lines 24-27, see "*the reflector is shaped to suppress primary-beam sidelobes*" and "*the reflector is specially shaped with a surface contour which directs lobes of the primary beam in directions away from the axis of the secondary beam*". That is, only the primary-beam's sidelobes is selected. (not the other) and it reads on applicant's "selectively suppressing") a side lobe of a beam having a first resource (see fig.5, beam 38 and beam 42) by selectively reshaping (column 2, lines 24-27, see "*the reflector is shaped to suppress primary-beam sidelobes*" and "*the reflector is specially shaped with a surface contour which directs lobes of the primary beam in directions away from the axis of the secondary beam*". That is, only the primary-beam's reflector is shaped (not the other) and it reads on applicant's "selectively reshaping") the antenna

Art Unit: 2686

surface at interference locations (column 2, lines 9-13, see “the reflector has been shaped specifically for coverage” and column 2, lines 13-30, see “the reflector is reshaped to suppress”) and maintaining a shape of the antenna in non-interference locations to form a suppressed portion and a non-suppressed portion (the teaching of Durvasula teaches sidelobe of only one beam is suppressed, the other is not, in addition, see fig.1, regions 40 and 44) so that the non-suppressed portion aligns with the second resource cell and side lobe suppressed portion aligns with the first resource cell (column 2, lines 9-13, see “the reflector has been shaped specifically for coverage” and column 2, lines 13-30, see “the reflector is reshaped to suppress”. The teaching of Durvasula inherently teaches that after the reflector is reshaped, the non-suppressed portion will align with the second resource cell and side lobe suppressed portion will align with the first resource cell. Also see fig.1, regions 40 and 44, and beams 30 and 32).

In addition, applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claims 1 and 9 in the previous Office action dated 11/26/2004.

For the above reasons, the examiner believes that the rejections to claims are proper.

### ***Conclusion***

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nghi H. Ly whose telephone number is (571)

Art Unit: 2686

272-7911. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am-5:30 pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on (571) 272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nghi H. Ly

*NH Ly*  
*03/31/05*